## Case 1:11-cr-01091-VM Document 518 Filed 08/29/13 Page 1 of 23

D85LLES1 Deliberations UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, New York, N.Y. 4 S14 11 Cr. 1091 (VM) V. 5 PETER LESNIEWSKI, MARIE BARAN and JOSEPH RUTIGLIANO, 6 Defendants. 7 -----X 8 9 August 5, 2013 9:51 a.m. 10 11 Before: 12 HON. VICTOR MARRERO, 13 District Judge 14 APPEARANCES 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York 17 BY: JUSTIN S. WEDDLE DANIEL BEN TEHRANI NICOLE WARE FRIEDLANDER 18 Assistant United States Attorneys 19 LAW OFFICES OF JOSHUA L. DRATEL, P.C. 20 Attorneys for Defendant Peter Lesniewski BY: JOSHUA LEWIS DRATEL 21 LINDSAY A. LEWIS 22 DURKIN & ROBERTS Attorneys for Defendant Peter Lesniewski 23 BY: THOMAS ANTHONY DURKIN 24 25

D85LLES1 Deliberations APPEARANCES CONTINUED KOEHLER & ISAACS, LLP Attorneys for Defendant Marie Baran BY: JOEY JACKSON JOSEPH W. RYAN, JR. KEVIN MENEILLY Attorneys for Defendant Joseph Rutigliano - also present -Annie Chen Emma Larson, Government Paralegals SA Frank LoMonaco, FBI Yeni Yrizarry, Defendant Baran Paralegal 

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Trial resumed)

(Jury not present)

THE COURT: Good morning. Welcome back. I hope you all had a relaxing weekend.

Two things. One, the Court received a note from the jury dated today at 9:25 and it says: Good morning. Several jurors have questions -- have requests for additional copy of the instructions and one additional copy of the indictment. They feel it would make it easier for them to follow the many details of the case. Thank you.

P.S. Are our voices carrying to distraction into the courtroom?

And then, May we please have a few more additional jury note forms.

All right. If there's no objection from any of the parties, we will give them an additional copy of the redacted indictment and additional copy of the Court's instructions plus the jury note forms.

This will be marked Court Exhibit No. 2.

Second, Friday when we left we were going to respond to their request for the transcript of the testimony of two witnesses, Mr. Parlante and Mr. Maher, pertaining to Mr. Rutigliano's services. We asked the parties to confer and develop a response of the appropriate portions of the transcript.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Has an agreement been reached on that?

MR. TEHRANI: Unfortunately not, your Honor. proposed a set of redacted testimony that we believe is responsive to the jury's note. We received some objections from both Mr. Ryan and Mr. Durkin, as well as some additional proposed testimony from Mr. Ryan. We've conferred about that and have reached some limited agreement, but we still seem to have fundamental disagreement about what is responsive to the jury's note.

If it's at all helpful, your Honor, I can pass up a copy of both Mr. Parlante's testimony and Mr. Maher's testimony that includes -- it is the government's proposal overlaid with the objections we've received.

What it does not include, I do not believe, and I will be corrected if I'm wrong, it does not include Mr. Ryan's proposed additional inserts and we are running copies of those right now.

THE COURT: What is the nature of the differences between the two?

MR. TEHRANI: The most fundamental difference is the government has proposed reading back the testimony or providing the jury with the testimony about the process that Mr. Maher and Mr. Parlante went through in filling out the application, which includes a discussion of the application, whether certain portions of the application are truthful, and whether Mr. Maher

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and Mr. Parlante told that information to Mr. Rutigliano, which in our view is directly responsive to the jury's request for testimony regarding Mr. Rutigliano's assistance in filling out the applications.

If these individuals were not telling Mr. Rutigliano the information that's included in the applications that they paid Mr. Rutigliano to fill out, that gets to Mr. Rutigliano's assistance in filling out those application materials.

The objections that we received are a couple. One is that Mr. Ryan has referred to it as narrative. I'm not sure exactly what that means. He has also suggested that it gets to nonconversations. I don't believe the jury's note was asking for conversations. I believe what the jury was asking for was information or testimony relating to Mr. Rutigliano's assistance in filling out the application materials. whether or not there was a conversation about it is not particularly relevant to whether the testimony is responsive to the jury's request.

Mr. Rutigliano has or Mr. Ryan has also proposed -and that's not what I'm about to pass up, but has proposed testimony relating to Mr. Rutigliano's reputation, the nature of conductor work, Mr. Parlante's accident or incident, his last day of work, none of which we believe is responsive at all to the jury's request.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ryan.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RYAN: Let me go in reverse order.

With respect to the Parlante testimony, on cross-examination the government agrees that he told Mr. Rutigliano about the episode -- that's getting hit by a train. And I have suggested that the episode, just a short excerpt of what the episode is be included.

And as cross-examination continued -- this gives you an idea of the dispute -- as to why Mr. Parlante told Mr. Rutigliano about the episode and he didn't want it included because he was embarrassed. The government objects to all of that. All they want is a section that did you tell Mr. Rutigliano about the episode? I did. That's all they want. That's an example.

Then there's another 15 pages of the direct examination where the witness was given a declaration in response to leading questions as to what was true and what was not true on the application. And dispersed in this declarative type testimony they would ask a question, did Mr. -- did you tell that to Mr. Rutigliano? He would say no.

So this is a declarative part of the witness's testimony, what he said he picks out in the application was false or inaccurate, but it's not based upon a discussion.

My understanding is the jury wants to know what happened between Mr. Rutigliano and Mr. Parlante or Mr. Rutigliano and Mr. Maher. So there's about 15 pages of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this declaratory type testimony that we've objected to.

There's also in the Parlante, I'm sorry, in the Maher testimony questions about, the government has included questions about what Mr. Maher told the grand jury on a prior occasion. So gives you an idea of the dispute.

Now, I can -- I have listed on a memorandum that I gave to the government what we objected to and what we asked for insertions. I don't know how your Honor wants to handle this. One suggestion I have is I'll hand this up. Government has a copy of it. We'll pick out the transcript portions in dispute. Your Honor can rule on it.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, just to clarify, if it is helpful for your Honor, that is what we tried to accomplish in the documents that we passed up. So what we passed up was what we had circulated to defense counsel as to what we think is responsive to the jury's note and we've indicated on what we circulated what Mr. Ryan and Mr. Durkin have objected to.

And we just got copies of what Mr. Ryan is proposing That would then be the nature -- that would be the document that Mr. Ryan wants to hand up, but it would be in transcript form rather than citation form.

MR. RYAN: We would appreciate copies of what was just handed up.

> There may be several ways we can approach THE COURT:

this.

One is to send a note back to the jury asking them to focus more precisely on either portions of the testimony that they're interested in or particular questions that they wanted to review answers to and then see what they say.

Second, or the second possibility to ask them is whether they want the entire testimony from those two witnesses from start to finish and see how they respond to that.

My take on these issues when they come up in this manner is to try to first see if the jury will refine their questions, zero in on particular issues or subjects that were part of the testimony.

Barring that, the jury sat through and they heard the testimony from start to finish. So there are no secrets there other than those that were discussed with the parties at side bars. And if we remove from the transcript the side bars and the questions that were objected to and sustained, then we have a pure transcript of what the jury heard.

To the extent the jury heard all of that, I don't see why there would be any objections to the jury hearing it again if that's what they want. But, again, there are no secrets there. It's all part of the transcript. The testimony, they heard it. If they want to hear it a second time, so be it.

So if the parties cannot come to an agreement as to what portions of the testimony addresses the question, I'll

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

give them the whole thing and take out what I just indicated, the side bars and the questions that were objected to and sustained.

The way I understand your Honor's MR. RYAN: suggestion is that you would give them a sanitized, if I can use that word, transcript of the testimony.

THE COURT: I said failing an agreement that's one way of approaching it. But I will first try to see if they can indicate more precisely the subject of the testimony that they are interested in. And if they say that it's only one portion or one particular topic, then we can hone in on those.

But if they cannot clarify, then just give them a sanitized version of the entire testimony and let them pore through it decide what it is they're looking for.

Mr. Tehrani.

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, if I may, the note was fairly specific about what they wanted. So I'm not sure.

THE COURT: Not specific enough to avoid questions from the other side as to what it meant.

MR. TEHRANI: Well, I don't know that Mr. Ryan's objections make the question any less specific. It seems to be that Mr. Ryan just doesn't want specific testimony before the jury again. And I don't know that what we want to do is in response to a fairly specific question dump an entire transcript of testimony of two witnesses that took hours and

tell the jury --

THE COURT: Mr. Tehrani, how would either the government or the defense be prejudiced by having the jury reread what they heard here in open court?

MR. TEHRANI: Not at all, your Honor. It's just a matter --

THE COURT: If you cannot come to an agreement, that's what I suggest is the direction.

MR. TEHRANI: I understand, your Honor. I guess what I'm suggesting is not that providing testimony that the jury has already heard would at all be prejudicial to anyone, it's just a matter of us being helpful and responsive to the jury when they provide a fairly specific request for testimony on a particular issue.

You know, one thing that we could do is get your Honor's guidance as to what you think might be responsive to the request, which might help the parties in any kind of discussion or negotiations or just have your Honor rule.

MR. RYAN: My suggestion is that your Honor consider giving the jury a note requesting them to be more specific if they can, or would they prefer transcript of the testimony.

MR. DRATEL: Just a matter of logistics, it sounds like the Court's preference is to give the jury a copy of the transcript rather than have a read back in open court. Is that my understanding?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: That's the way we usually handle it.

MR. DRATEL: OK. Thanks.

THE COURT: There's no point in having them come out here in open court and reading hours of testimony. Just give it to them and if they want to go through it at their leisure, it's their prerogative.

MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Weddle.

MR. WEDDLE: Your Honor, I think that the objections by Mr. Rutigliano are just strategic. I don't think there's actually a real dispute here about what is responsive to the jury's note and what is not responsive to the jury's note.

I think that if your Honor just looks at the transcript, we marked with a pen in the margin the parts that Mr. Rutigliano objects to and I think that it would be very straightforward to just say he objects to that but that is responsive to the jury's note or it's not responsive to the jury's note and then we just resolve it that way.

I think that's a better way to handle this than to redact the whole transcript. And essentially your Honor asked the jury to give a specific request. They gave specific request. In my view, it's quite easy to respond to that request. I don't think there are a lot of gray areas on what is responsive to their request and isn't responsive to their request. Character testimony --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Weddle, that's in your view, but in Mr. Ryan's view there are gray areas and that's why we're here and that's why the jury has already been waiting 35 minutes for something we told them they would have already this morning.

MR. WEDDLE: Your Honor, for Mr. Ryan to say that one of these witness's testimony about Joseph Rutigliano's reputation as a union leader is responsive to the testimony as pertaining to Joseph Rutigliano's assistance with the applications is just not even close to a gray area. That's just something that he wants to put in.

And I think that these are -- this should be a straightforward answer. I was surprised by the objections that we received. I think that it's a very straightforward note that's specific. And I think in the actual testimony that's responsive to it is limited and easy to designate and we should just go through and look at what he's objected to and see if your Honor thinks that it's responsive to their request for the testimony of these two people as pertains to Joseph Rutigliano's assistance. I think it clearly is.

But I think it would be more useful to do this looking directly at the language than to do it in the abstract because I don't think these are substantial disputes here.

THE COURT: Mr. Ryan.

May I remind the Court that the MR. RYAN: government's submission is that the witnesses heard about

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Rutigliano and they wanted to make a paper trail. So the circumstances under which they came to Mr. Rutigliano in the government's submission is directly relevant to their other testimony that they went to him as a union leader as well. So that gives you an idea of the benefit of giving the jury both sides of the coin.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Let me ask, looking at the testimony of Mr. Maher as an example, and as I understand it, the government has blacked out the redacted section, that's blacked out.

There's some questions on lines 20 through 22. In the margin it says Ryan objection. And just a couple more pages. A few more pages in, this is on page 974, which begins the long section marked on the left margin as objection.

Does that suggest that, Mr. Ryan, your objection is to most of everything from page 974 through roughly 1003?

MR. RYAN: Yes, because that's what we have characterized as the declaratory part of the testimony by the witness.

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, I also note, if you want to look at page 981, we're talking about showing both sides of the coin here, the one portion of this entire section about Mr. Rutigliano's assistance that is not objected to is the portion where the witness testifies that he actually told Mr. Rutigliano something.

MR. RYAN: Yes, I have no objection to that.

MR. TEHRANI: The rest of the portion where Mr. Rutigliano filled it out without any input from Mr. Maher is objected to.

THE COURT: Let me come back to what I said before now. It seems to me that if we gave the jury everything that's in here that's blocked out and that is objected to, does not that amount to just about all of the testimony of Mr. Maher?

MR. TEHRANI: No, your Honor, there's significantly more. What you have is not all of Mr. Maher's testimony with just portions blacked out. If there were entire pages where there was nothing that the government was proposing as responsive to the request, that's not even before you.

THE COURT: That portion as to which the parties have no difficulty sending to the jury, does this represent that?

Does this excerpt that you've given me represent that portion which you've reviewed together and there's no dispute other than those which are marked in the margin?

MR. TEHRANI: Yes, your Honor, although there are some additional inserts that Mr. Rutigliano would propose that are not before you that I could hand up if you would like.

MR. RYAN: Please hand them up.

THE COURT: And then we still have Mr. Parlante, about which you have the same kind of disputes.

MR. TEHRANI: For Mr. Parlante, yes, your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. I'm not going to sit here and engage in this kind of debate as to whether or not something is or is not responsive and the parties cannot agree as to what's responsive.

I'm going to ask the jury to be more precise as to the topics of the testimony that they're interested if they can be. We elicit that. If they cannot be, then my inclination is to give them the whole thing and let them -- again, their prerogative, their time -- go through the testimony.

In the meantime, we can get an extra copy of the instructions and an extra copy of the indictment and some more jury note forms to hand them. Let me draft.

MS. FRIEDLANDER: Your Honor, just one quick comment. First I want to echo what Mr. Weddle said. I think Mr. Ryan has objected essentially to all of the testimony about Mr. Rutigliano's assistance with these people's applications.

THE COURT: If he objected to all of it, in that case what's wrong with having the jury see all of it?

> MR. RYAN: No objection.

MS. FRIEDLANDER: This is the point that I wanted to raise is that I think this will create an incentive for the parties not to agree on any response to any juror note for any testimony because now if the answer is going to be simply if you don't like what the government is proposing, don't worry about it, we'll just send back all the testimony, then I think

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that's where we're going to wind up in response to every question that we get. So I think this might be not creating the right incentives for the parties going forward.

It also sort of punishes the jury. Again, we think this is a pretty specific request as juror notes go. And it's going to be for the jury now to sort through hours of testimony from these witnesses to try to find the response to what we think was a pretty specific question.

THE COURT: All right. I heard you.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Here's the note that I propose sending back to the jury from myself:

As to your note of 8/2/13, asks for certain testimony of two witnesses pertaining to Mr. Rutigliano's services: Mr. Maher and Mr. Parlante. The testimony of those witnesses was very extensive. Can you provide more specifics about the subjects, more questions in their testimony that you seek to review as they relate to Mr. Rutigliano.

All right. If there's no objection, I will send this to the jury through the court officer.

MR. RYAN: I guess your Honor has rejected the alternative of providing them, suggesting a transcript.

THE COURT: Depending upon what comes out of this.

MR. RYAN: OK.

THE COURT: I will add the additional copies of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

instructions, the indictment, and the note forms will be provided to you momentarily.

I just added a sentence: The additional copies of the Court's instructions, the indictment, and jury note forms that you requested will be provided momentarily.

There's nothing more we can productively do while we're waiting for the clarification, so just recess until we hear back.

(Recess pending verdict)

(Jury not present; time noted: 11:10 a.m.)

THE COURT: Mr. Durkin, are you done with your other matter?

MR. DURKIN: Well, I never got started, Judge, because the courtroom was sealed and apparently they couldn't get a secure line to hook me in. So they're going to call me. So if I step out, they're going to call me at some point.

THE COURT: That will be fine.

MR. DURKIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: The Court received a note from the jury dated 10:45 a.m., dated today. Re Maher and Parlante.

- We are confused about how Maher's application was submitted to the RRB.
- May we hear testimony that states Joe Rutigliano was paid in cash to help in application process.

Thank you. Signed by the foreperson.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that this elicits the specifics that we requested. I cannot imagine them being more narrow and particular in what they're asking. So there's no reason why there should be too much debate about what portions of the testimony of those two witnesses would be responsive.

I assume Mr. Rutigliano and Maher, the question is how was the application submitted to the RRB. The question is to whether it was directly by Mr. Rutigliano or to what extent Mr. Maher read it and submitted it. That's probably what the nature of questions relate to, so there's no reason why anything beyond those issues should be pertinent or responsive.

Second, with regards to both Mr. Parlante and Mr. Maher, the question is whether they paid Mr. Rutigliano in cash for their services.

All right. So if you could then review the testimony and see if you could identify those portions that relate to these two questions, we should be able to put this behind us.

For your information, the jury also sent in their lunch order to be delivered at 1 o'clock.

All right. If there's nothing else, I will await your response to these two questions from the testimony. If you can agree upon it among yourselves, just provide the copy that has the agreed upon testimony and hand it to the court security officer.

If in the unlikely event that there are disputes, then

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we'll get back together again. All right.

MR. WEDDLE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. This will be marked the appropriate court exhibit number now.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Three.

THE COURT: We have the Court's note two. So this will be No. 3.

(Recess pending verdict)

(Jury not present; time noted: 4:41 p.m.)

THE COURT: Just a number of housekeeping matters.

First, pursuant to the note that was sent by the jury concerning the testimony of Mr. Maher and Mr. Parlante, the parties reached an understanding of what portions of the transcript responded to the jury note and those portions were transmitted to the jury through the court officer.

Second, the Court received a note from the jury dated today at 3 p.m. and it reads as follows:

Greetings. We're planning to stop deliberations at 4:45 today. We are making good progress working through the counts.

This will be marked as Court Exhibit No. 4, I believe.

The Court also received another note, this one signed by the foreperson today, 4:05 p.m., and it reads as follows:

Clarification? Re instructions, page 63, line 17, end of line 17, "The government..." We are confused about why

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Counts 19 to 20 are singled out with requirement to identify specific wire transmission. Also, why the phrase "and so on" is included, what it refers to regarding this count.

Thank you. Signed by the foreperson.

The language of the instructions which this jury note relates is in the instructions on page 63. The text of that passage reads, The government need not prove all of these wire transmissions so long as the government proves at least one of these transmissions for the wire fraud count you are considering. In other words, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt one interstate wire transmission for Count 19 and at least one interstate transmission for Count 20 and so on.

Now, my understanding of the reason why Counts 19 and Count 20 are there was for illustrative purposes. There are six wire fraud counts, 14 through 20, and it just happens that 19 and 20 are the last two. The language "and so on" is intended to refer to all of the wire fraud Counts 14 through 20, and it just so happens to those two were the last in the It could just as well have said 14 and 15 and so on. And so I will so instruct the jury. I'll clarify for the jury.

I will also clarify that the language simply means what it says, that for each of the Counts 14 through 20, the jury needs to find at least one wire transmission associated with any particular count that they're considering.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So if there's no misunderstanding about that, I will so clarify for them.

If there are no other questions, I will ask the court security officer to bring the jury in. I will give them this clarification and then dismiss them for the evening.

(Jury present; time noted: 4:47 p.m.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Thank you. Welcome back.

We have received your note indicating that you contemplate or contemplated returning as of 4:45, so that's fine. We're calling you to adjourn you for the day.

I also have your later note seeking clarification about the instruction on page 63. That relates to the wire fraud counts, and you indicate that you were confused about why Counts 19 and 20 are singled out to identify specific wire transmission and also what the meaning of the phrase "and so on," why it's included at the end of that sentence.

As you are aware by now, the indictment contains seven wire fraud counts, 14 through 20. There are seven of them. Ιt just so happens that 19 and 20 are the last two. So the instruction that is given there pertains to all seven, meaning that the government need not prove all of the wire transmissions. It needs to prove at least one associated with each of the seven counts. And when we indicate Counts 19 and 20 and we say and so on, it means that this applies to all of I could just as well have said 14 and 15 and so on. them.

1 THE FOREPERSON: OK. THE COURT: Clear? 2 3 THE FOREPERSON: I think so. Thank you. THE COURT: So with that I will understand that you're 4 5 adjourning for the evening and you're returning tomorrow, what time? 6 7 THE FOREPERSON: 9:30. 8 THE COURT: All right. I want to thank you again. 9 And recall the standard instruction. At some point I'll just 10 say ditto and you'll know what I mean, press a button. 11 Do not discuss the case among yourselves or with 12 anyone on the outside or have any contact of any kind with 13 anyone involved with the case. If any of these things occur, 14 you're directed to inform me immediately and not discuss it 15 with your fellow jurors. 16 Have a good evening. We'll see you tomorrow. 17 THE FOREPERSON: Thank you very much. 18 (Jury not present; time noted: 4:51 p.m.) THE COURT: Just one further note very briefly. 19 20 Mr. Ryan has requested that we provide him with copies 21 of the jury notes. These notes have been read into the record. 22 They're part of the record. So if anybody wishes to have 23 copies for your purposes, we will make them available. 24 I understand there was a request from a member of the 25

press for copies of the jury notes. For the same reason,

## Case 1:11-cr-01091-VM Document 518 Filed 08/29/13 Page 23 of 23

D85LLES3 Deliberations

they're part of the public record. They've been read into the transcripts. So I have no reason not to provide them to members of the press if requested.

If there's nothing else, then I thank you and have a

good evening. We'll see you tomorrow.

(Adjourned to August 6, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.)